4. 2. 10

THE

Late King *JAMES*'s

Second Manifesto,

Directed to the Protestant Princes,

ANSWERED

Paragraph by Paragraph.

LONDON:

Printed for *Richard Baldwin*, near the *Oxford-Arms* in *Warwick-Lane*. MDCXCVII.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Late King *James*'s *Manifeſto*, directed to the Catholick Princes, Anſwered Paragraph by Paragraph. Sold by *Richard Baldwin*, near the *Oxford-Arms*.

TRINITY COLLEGE
LIBRARY,
CAMBRIDGE

THE Late King *JAMES*'s Second Manifesto ANSWER'D, &c.

THE late King *James*'s last *Manifesto* having met with such general Contempt, both from the *English* Nation, and from the Princes it was directed to; it is to be wondered at, that he or his Ministers have had the Confidence to put out a Second. My wonder increased very much when I came to read it; for tho his former was the weakest Piece in this kind that I ever met with, the Second is ten times worse; and methinks the Council of *St. Germains* must be very weak themselves, or have a very disadvantageous Opinion of the World, to hope that such poor and pitiful Arguments may oblige the Catholick and Protestant Princes to enter into a War with His present Majesty, to whom they owe in a great measure the Preservation of their Domi-

nions, in favour of a Prince, whom Juſtice, Treaties, and Common Humanity could never move to joyn with them to put a ſtop to the Progreſs of the Arms of *France*, which threaten'd *Europe* with a cruel Slavery. This preſumption is ſo extravagant in it ſelf, and ſo near a-kin to Folly, that I queſtioned at firſt the Truth of theſe two *Manifeſto's*, and ſuſpected that they might be the product of ſome Enemies of the late King, to banter him, and ridicule his Councils; but having made a due Enquiry into that matter, I found that they are Authentick, and owned by King *James*, and his Party; and therefore I thought that the firſt having been made publick in *Engliſh*, and received by our Nation as it deſerved, there can be no danger in publiſhing this, which really is harmleſs even in compariſon with the other.

MANIFESTO:

A Summary Account of the Reaſons which ought to oblige the Proteſtant Princes and States to contribute to the Reſtoration of His *Britanick* Majeſty.

THE *Reaſons which engaged the King of* Great Britain *to direct a Memorial to the Catholick Confederate Princes, do oblige him likewiſe to direct another to the Proteſtants engaged in the ſame Cauſe: His Majeſty being ſo far from looking upon them as irreconcilable Enemies, who cannot take any manner of concern in his juſt Complaints of all the Divine and Humane Laws violated in his Perſon, that he is perſwaded,*

that

that though the Zeal for the Protestant Religion has brought those Princes into the Engagements they are now under, and that they may endeavour to justify themselves upon that specious Pretence, yet there is not one of them but acknowledges that the Protestants are equally concerned in all that was said to the Catholicks.

ANSWER.

The Sense of this Paragraph is not easily to be found out; and those few Lines have doubtless cost the Penman of this *Manifesto* a great deal of pains. But notwithstanding his Artifice, whosoever will compare it with the former, will be convinced of the falsity of this Suggestion: For then as King *James* thought to stand in no need of the Protestant Princes, he proclaimed War against them, made the Good of the Catholick Religion the chief, not to say the only Motive that ought to engage the Catholick Princes to endeavour his Restoration; bestowed upon the Protestants the Title of Heretick, and all the vile Names he could find, which certainly he would not have done, had he resolved then to court their Friendship and Assistance; or else he supposed, which would be the highest degree of Folly, that his *Manifesto* directed to the Catholick Princes would never fall into the hands of the Protestants. How then can this Author advance, that the Protestants are equally concerned in what was said to the Catholicks? King *William* is represented to them as a Persecutor of their Religion, which he endeavours to prove by the new Laws enacted in *Ireland* against Papists; and by the Act of the Succession to the Crown, from which the Papists are excluded; from whence he concludes,

that

that this ought to oblige them to procure his Restoration; but is this a fit Motive for the Protestants? Certainly this is a piece of Confidence peculiar to the Writers of St. *Germains*. Were it necessary, I could make it appear, that King *James* never designed to demand the Assistance of the Protestant Princes when he published his first *Manifesto*, and that he was then in hopes to imbroil all the Allies; because much about that time the Emperor and some of the Protestant Princes did not altogether so well agree as they did before, and are like to do for the future, which is hinted at in the first Lines of his first *Manifesto*.

The true Reason then of King *James* directing this Memorial to the Protestant Princes, is, because he finds the Catholicks unwilling and unable to perform what he demanded; and in order to heal the Wound his former gave to his Interest amongst the Protestants, who being justly incensed by his provoking Language, lost even the Compassion they had for him. It is ridiculous to say that the Zeal for the Protestant Religion unites them with King *William*; for tho it may have some share in it, yet their Common Defence against the Common Enemy of *Europe*, is the chief Cement of their Union; and King *James* will never be able to perswade the World, that this is a War of Religion, tho the Preservation of the Protestant Religion, whereof the Extirpation was resolved upon, is mightily concerned in it. I refer to another place my remarks on the Violation of the Divine and Humane Laws he complains of.

MANIFESTO.

The Decalogue, the observation of Oaths, the obedience due to the Lawful Soveraigns, and Laws of each Country, are

are Obligations common to all Christians, and even to the most Barbarous Nations; and since the famous Confession of Augsbourg, *to these late Times, no Protestant Society, except the Fanaticks, durst deny these Articles. All the Protestant Churches agree, That it is not lawful to take the Name of God in vain, and violate the Oaths to which he has been called to witness; That Parents are to be honoured; and that it is not lawful to take other mens Estates; and the Scriptures, which they own for the only Rule of their Faith, and of their Morals, do teach them, that not only such who commit great Crimes, but also such who approve and countenance them, cannot be partakers of the Kingdom of God. 'Tis notorious then in* Sweden, Denmark, Germany, *and other Hereditary Protestant Countries, that they were never suffered to preach any Doctrine concerning the Obedience due to Soveraigns, and to Laws, different from that which has been constantly maintained and asserted in* England, *except during the Revolutions; from whence it follows, that the Protestant Princes are by the Principles of their own Religion obliged to acknowledge, that all the vain Pretences the Prince of* Orange *has made use of to colour his Usurpation, are as contrary to the Maxims of the Religion they profess, as to the Catholick.*

ANSWER.

This *Cant* signifies nothing to the purpose; we may grant the Premisses, but deny the Consequence; for it is too general; and therefore I think fit to examine this matter somewhat more strictly, to shew the ridiculousness of this Argument. That Obedience is due to Lawful Soveraigns, That Oaths are to be kept, we grant it with all Christians, and other Nations: But that it follows from thence, that a Tyrant is to be obeyed,

ed, we deny; and therefore, to come nearer to the Case in hand: As long as *James* the Second ruled according to Our Constitution, and the Oaths he had taken, we say he was our Lawful Soveragin, and it was Rebellion to resist him; but when he invaded our Liberties, Properties, and our Religion, which is a considerable Article of our Government, and which he had particularly sworn to preserve; when he assumed an Arbitrary Power, and endeavoured the total Subversion of the Government; then we say, that *ipso facto*, he abdicated the Legal and limited Power vested in him, became a Tyrant, and actually ceased to be King; for our Law does not know any such King as he pretended to be; therefore he could claim no obedience from us, because we were no longer his Subjects, and to resist him was no Rebellion, but a necessary defence against an open and declared Enemy; for Rebellion is resisting the *just Power of the Government*; and Natural Defence is to repel and resist an unjust and usurped Power, such as was that assumed by the Late King *James*. The obligation of the Oaths of Allegiance can signify nothing in this Case; for as I have already said, Allegiance is due, and sworn only to a King, who governs by Law, and not to a Tyrant: But I would fain ask this Gentleman, who pretends to be so well versed in the Divine and Human Laws, where he has found that Subjects are bound to stand to their Oaths, tho never so much conditional, and that Princes are free from that obligation? for otherwise it being as plain as the Day at Noon, that King *James* violated his Coronation Oath, he could not pretend to the Allegiance of his Subjects after that violation, unless he thinks that Princes are not bound by their Oaths.

We

We are prohibited to take what belongs to our Neighbours, and from that Principle it follows, That Subjects cannot invade the juſt Prerogatives of their Kings, nor Kings neither invade the Rights and Properties of their Subjects; and that whoſoever goes againſt this Maxim, ſins againſt God, and may be reſiſted: And thereby we juſtifie our Reſiſtance to King *James*, who ſo violently invaded the Liberties of the People of *England*.

We are not to learn our Duty toward the Supream Powers from the *Swedes*, *Danes*, or *Germans*; for God having not Authorized any one Form of Government more than another, and the true Original of Civil Society and Government, being but a Compromiſe made by a Body of Men, it follows that every Nation had Right to chooſe what Form of Government they pleaſed, to *which* they are bound to ſtand; and therefore the Meaſures of Power, and conſequently of Obedience, muſt be taken from the expreſs Laws of any State, or Body of Men, from the Oaths that they Swear, or from immemorial Preſcription, which is alſo a good Title: So that upon the whole matter, the Degrees of all Civil Authority, are to be taken either from expreſs Laws, immemorial Cuſtoms, or from particular Oaths. But it muſt be laid down for an undeniable Principle, That in all the Diſputes between Power and Liberty, Power muſt be proved, but Liberty proves it ſelf; the firſt being founded only upon Poſitive Law, and the laſt upon the Law of Nature. Now the Law of Nature having put no difference or ſubordination among Men, unleſs it be that of Children to Parents, or of Wives to their Huſbands, and Natural and Revealed Religion preſcribing nothing in this Caſe but Submiſſion to the Conſtitution

under which we are, we must learn what we owe to our Kings from the Constitution of the *English* Government.

I know that in the late Reigns, some Court Parasites and mean Persons, who wanted real Merit to expect any Preferment upon that Account, preached up *Passive Obedience* and *Non-Resistance* to the Supream Power, to ingratiate themselves with the Court, and this is the Doctrine mentioned in this Paragraph: But tho' one would look upon Divines as Infallible Guides, to lead us into the Kingdom of Heaven, we are not determined in this Case by their Opinion, nor by any Speculation about Sovereign Power, or some Passages of the *Old* and *New Testament*, but by the Laws and Regulations that have been made amongst us. The Doctrine of Passive Obedience is so ridiculous, that to confound the Spreaders thereof, I'le appeal only from their Sermons and Writings to their Practice; for as long as they had no occasion to put in practice their Principle, they held it out bravely; but as soon as King *James* began to pinch them, they cried out louder than all the rest, and declared for Actual Resistance.

The Executive Part of the Government is lodged singly in the King, but the Legislative Power is lodged between the King and the two Houses of Parliament; so then the Power of making and Repealing Laws, is not singly in the King, but only so far as the two Houses concur with him; and therefore his Prerogative is circumscribed within a certain Extent, beyond which he has no Authority. As for instance; If he Levies Money of his People without a Law, he goes beyond the Limits of his Power, and may, nay and must be resisted. *England* is a Free Nation, that has its Rights

Rights and Liberties secured to it by many Positive and and expres Laws; if then we have a Right to our Property, we must likewise be supposed to have a Right to Preserve it against the incroachments of our King, or any Body else.

But when a King not satisfied with the limited Power the Law of *England* gives him, takes upon him to suspend the Laws without the Consent of both Houses of Parliament; to Levy Money without any Law to impower him to do it; to invade the Liberties of his People, and destroy their Religion, all against his Coronation Oath; his doing so amounts to a real Abdication of the Legal Title he had to be King, according to *Grotius* and all other Authors; and a Positive Law enacted in King *Edward* the Confessor's time, and confirmed by *William* the Conqueror, *Rex autem*, &c. *The King, because he is the Vicar of the Supream King, is Constituted to this end, that he may govern his Earthly Kingdom, and the People of the Lord; and especially to Reverence and Govern God's Holy Church, and defend it from Injuries, and extirpate all wrong doers. The King must act all things according to Law, and by the Judgment the* Proceres Regni, *for Right and Justice ought to Reign in the Realm, rather then a perverse Will, which if he does not perform,* **he shall not retain so much as the Name of a King.** King *John* having subjected the Kingdom of *England* to the Pope, subverted good Customs, and endeavoured to enslave the Church and the Realm, was in a General Assembly, and with the Approbation of the Realm, adjudged unworthy to be King. And *Edward* the Second was some time after Deposed for his Tyranny. This Point being the only one that deserveth to be taken notice of in this *Manifesto*, I beg leave to insist a little longer upon it, and to

relate here the Meſſage that was ſent to *Richard* the Second, as it is in *Knighton Coll.* 2681.

The King having abſented himſelf from his Parliament, they ſent him a Meſſage to deſire him to return to redreſs their Grievances. To which the King replied, *Now I plainly ſee that my People and the Commons deſign to oppoſe me with Force, and are about to make an Inſurrection againſt me; and if I be ſo inſeſted, I think the beſt courſe I can take will be to my Coſin the King of* France, *and ask his Advice and his Aid againſt thoſe that way lay me, and rather to ſubmit my ſelf to him, than be foiled by my own Subjects.* To which the Meſſengers replied, *That Counſel is not for your good, but will inevitably tend to your Ruin: For the King of* France *is your Capital Enemy, and the greateſt Adverſary that your Kingdom has; and if he ſhould ſet his Foot within your Kingdom, he would rather endeavour to prey upon you, and invade your Realm, and to Depoſe you from your Royal Dignity, than afford you any Aſſiſtance, if, which God forbid, you ſhould ſtand in need of his help. Call to mind therefore how your Grandfather King* Edward *the Third, and your Father Prince* Edward *for him fought indefatigably in Sweat and Sorrow, all their days, to acquire the Kingdom of* France, *which by Hereditary Right appertained to them.* They go on with their Grievances, which they lay upon his Evil Miniſters; and afterwards tell him, *There remains yet another part of our Meſſage to be imparted to you on the behalf of your People. They find in an ancient Statute, and it has been done in fact not long ago, that if the King, through any evil Counſel or fooliſh Contumacy, or out of Scorn, or ſome ſingular petulant Will of his own, or by any other irregular Means ſhall alienate himſelf from his People, and ſhall refuſe to be governed and guided by the Laws of the Realm*

Realm and the Statutes, and the laudable Ordinances thereof, together with the wholſome Advice of the Lords and Great Men of his Realm, but perſiſting headſtrong in his own hair-brain'd Counſels, ſhall patulantly proſecute his own ſingular Humour. That then it ſhall be lawful for them, with the common aſſent and conſent of the People of the Realm, to Depoſe the ſame King from the Regal Throne, and to ſet up ſome other of the Royal Blood in his room.

It being therefore plain, that a King of *England* may renounce and abdicate his Kingſhip, by Facts contrary to the original Contract, and the fundamental Conſtitution of the Government; the Queſtion is, Whether King *James* has done ſo or no? But that he has, I think no body can doubt, even not the Penman of his laſt Manifeſto, notwithſtanding what he ſays in his Vindication; for King *James* having the Nomination of the Judges, and turned out of their Places, ſuch, who did not declare for his Arbitrary Power; their Advice can never be brought in as an Excuſe to juſtify him. I would not however be underſtood, as if I ſhould ſay, that every Violation of the Law, or Deviation from it, ſhould be reckoned an Abdication of the Government; it muſt be a Violation of all the Fundamental Laws, and the breaking in upon the whole Conſtitution it ſelf, as King *James* did; for the Power of diſpenſing with the Laws which he aſſumed, implies the entire Diſſolution of the Government, for then the Subject has no Law, and nothing to depend upon.

King *James* having thus Abdicated the Government, and withdrawn himſelf into *France*, I think no body can deny, but the People had Power to ſet up *ſome other of the Royal Blood* in his room, without offend-

offending againſt any of the Laws and Maxims of the Chriſtian Religion: The Prince of *Orange* might accept the Crown by the ſame Principle, and therefore nothing can be more impertinent and falſe, than the concluſion of the Paragraph of King *James*'s Manifeſto, I have now anſwered, that the Pretences made uſe of by the Prince of *Orange*, to colour his Uſurpation, are contrary to the Maxims of the Chriſtian Religion; for Chriſt having preſcribed no Form of Government, and left every Nation to their Liberty in that Point, he is Rightful and Lawful King, who is King according to the Law of the Realm, as his preſent Majeſty now is.

MANIFESTO.

They muſt alſo agree, that the Conſequences that may be drawn from ſo pernicious an Example, are no leſs dangerous to them than to the Catholicks, and eſpecially to the Proteſtants of Germany: *For if Treaties confirmed by the moſt ſacred Oaths, a ſolemn Recognition of neighbouring Princes by their Embaſſies, Letters, and other publick Acts, are inſignificant, no Prince can be ſure to enjoy peaceably their State, and to tranſmit it to their Poſterity. It is upon the publick Faith of ſuch Acts, that moſt of the Proteſtant Princes of* Germany *enjoy vaſt Territories formerly belonging to the Church, the Poſſeſſion whereof was confirmed to them by the Treaties of* Weſtphalia. *Now if an Emperor, Powerful and Ambitious, ſhould, under Pretence that theſe Uſurpations were made againſt the Fundamental Laws of the Empire, and that the Popes have proteſted againſt thoſe laſt Treaties, go about to Annul and Revoke the particular Capitulation made by him, as contrary to the Laws of the Empire, and*

and the Original Contract between his Predeceſſors and the deprived Churches; 'tis certain, that he would be better grounded, than all the Proteſtant Princes have been, in countenancing the pretended Abdication of his Majeſty; and the Conſequences drawn from it to declare the Throne of England *vacant, and give it to a Forreigner, the Hereditary Succeſſion being ancienter in* England, *than in the Electorates, and other Dominions of* Germany.

ANSWER.

The late King's Cauſe is ſo bad, that the beſt Logician in the World would have a difficult TASK to make a tolerable Apology for it; and the Author of this Manifeſto being, as I conceive, no extraordinary Man, the Blunder he falls into in this Paragraph is not much to be wonder'd at. His Deſign, if he has any, is to ſhew that the Conſequences of what has been done in *England*, may be fatal to other Princes, and eſpecially to the Proteſtants of *Germany*; but I am ſure this proves the contrary; for if King *James* had been ſuffered to tread under Foot, our ſacred Laws and Liberties with Impunity, this might have been a bad Example, and perhaps encouraged an Emperour of *Germany* to make the ſame Attempt upon the Laws and Liberties of the Empire; whereas the ſad Cataſtrophe of the late King *James* will likely cool and reſtrain the Ambition of Princes, who are bound, as he was, to Govern according to Law, and not according to their Arbitrary Will, for fear of undergoing the ſame Fate. The Emperour is bound by his Oath to obſerve all the Laws of the Empire, and to leſſen or prejudice no ways the Rights and Priviledges of the Princes of the Em-

Empire; and yet, according to this Gentleman, he would have more ground to violate those Laws, than the Protestants had to countenance the Abdication of the late King, which was none of their doing, and is justifiable by the Laws of Nature, Reason, and Religion. Surely this Gentleman has a strange Notion of an Oath, and makes it plain enough, that he believes Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks. This Conclusion concerning the Antiquity of the Hereditary Succession in *England*, signifies nothing at all, for King *James* had no larger Prerogatives than his Predecessors, and therefore he might have been dealt withal as they were. I'le observe by the by, that the Treaties of *Westphalia*, are now part of the Imperial Constitution, which the Emperour swears to preserve; and the opposition of the Pope is altogether insignificant.

MANIFESTO.

Those Protestant Princes and States cannot deny, but they have owned the King of Great Britain *upon his Accession to the Throne, and that they Complimented him by their Ministers, Treated with him, and Congratulated him upon the Birth of the Prince of* Wales. *'Tis known also that these are the most solemn Acts that may be transacted between Crowned Heads, and the strongest Engagements that may be amongst Men. How then will these Princes justifie, what they have done against his Majesty, in Confederating themselves with his Enemy, against the Faith of all their Treaties, without any previous Declaration of War, nay without any subject of Complaint, seeing they have made none since the Revolution; and that the Treaties between them and* England *are the very same that were concluded with King* Charles, *which shews how Religiously they were observed by his Majesty, and that they have had no pretence to infringe them.*

ANSWER.

ANSWER.

'Tis true, the Protestant Princes as well as the Catholicks, owned King *James* for King of *England*, congratulated him, &c. but yet for all that, they may easily justify their Confederacy with King *William*; for those Embassies were sent to, and the Treaties transacted with King *James*, not as *James Steward*, as he fancies, but as King of *England*, and only in that Capacity; so that when he has ceased to be King by his *Abdication*, and that the People of *England*, have set up another, they are not obliged to consider him but as a *private Gentleman*, and all the Respect due to Crowned Heads, the Obligations by Treaties and Alliances are devolved upon his Successor; for in short, all these things belong to the Crown. There was no need of any previous Declaration of War for this; and 'tis ridiculous to demand it. As long as he continued on the Throne, the Allies complained to him of the daily Usurpations of *France*, and desired him to enter into Consultations in order to oppose them, as he was obliged to do. The Emperour sent Count *Caunitz* to him to make the same Representation, but all to no purpose, the late King, as he tells us in his first Manifesto, being unwilling to break with a Prince, against whom he had no Subject of Complaint, and foreseeing the fatal Consequences of this War. This refusal was a just Cause of Expostulations, but not a sufficient Motive to declare War against him; so that they gave over their Instances and Sollicitations. But some time after, King *James* having *Abdicated* his Throne, and the Prince of *Orange* being advanced to the Crown of *England*, they sent their Embassadors according to

custom to Congratulate him, and at the same time represented that *France* had unjustly invaded their Territories, and therefore desired the Execution of the Treaties concluded with his Predecessors; which Demand being founded upon Justice and Necessity, his Majesty by the Advice of his People, consented to, and entred into a more strict Alliance with the Confederate Princes against *France*. What can be more natural than this, and what can be more easily justified? The late King himself fancies surely very considerable in the World, since we are told, that the Protestant Princes Confederated themselves with his Enemy against him; but certainly he lies under a very gross mistake, for there is no need of any Confederacy against a Private Man, and no Prince in *Europe* that I know of, is in War against him, and therefore let him not be afraid of this Confederacy. It is only against the King of *France*.

If King *James* finds this Doctrine new and surprising, he lives near *Versailles*, where there are fit Men to instruct him; and therefore let him ask the French Ministers how they did behave themselves in relation to their old Friend *Mahomet* the IV. Emperour of the Turks, who was deposed much about the same time that he himself Abdicated the Crown of *England*, and they will tell him, that notwithstanding their Alliance with that unfortunate Prince, who by their Solicitations, broke the Truce with the Emperour, they congratulated *Soliman* the III. his Successor, not at all concerning themselves whether his Deposition were right or wrong, and continued their Alliance with him, who was in Possession of the Throne, and the lawful Successor of *Mahomet*. Let him ask them also, altho' he may remember it himself, how the Princes of *Europe* acted

in

in relation to the late King of *Portugal*, who for a few Acts of Rage was deprived of his Crown, nay, of his Wife too, to give them to his younger Brother; and they will tell him, that all the Princes of *Europe* thought that the *Portuguees* had their own Laws to govern themselves by, that by those Laws their King had rendred himself unworthy of the Crown, and consequently they could not but approve what they had done, and own *Don Pedro*, as if his Brother had been then dead. This is King *James*'s Case, he was Born an Heir to the Crown of *England*, which is a Government limited by Laws; he succeeded his Brother upon the conditions contained in his Coronation Oath, and the Laws which he Swore to observe; but soon after being weary of holding his Kingly Office any longer upon such Terms, he Renounced and Abdicated it, by Facts which sufficiently manifested the intention of his Mind, and then to confirm it, withdrew into *France*. The People of *England* in a full Convention offered thereupon their slighted Crown to the Prince and Princess of *Orange*, who accepted it. Now what could the Princes of *Europe* conclude, but that King *James* had some reasons to do what he did, and that the People of *England* had also just grounds to offer their Crown to another Prince, and consequently to own his Majesty as Rightful and lawful King of *England*, and treat with him as such. This is not Violating, as King *James* says, the Treaties concluded either with King *Charles* or King *James* himself, but exactly observing them.

MANIFESTO

But ſuppoſing his Majeſty had given them ſome reaſon to break thoſe Treaties, what had the Prince of Wales, *the preſumptive Heir of the Crown done, to forſake him, as they did? ſince according to the Form of all Treaties tranſacted between Crowned Heads, their Poſterity, Heirs, and Succeſſors, are therein included. If it, that they will make the World believe, they are perſwaded, that he is Suppoſititious? A Calumny ſo fooliſh and extravagant, that thoſe who advanced it, have not dared to bring it to a judicial Examination, as the Prince of* Orange *promiſed in his Declaration: 'Tis not believed, that any of thoſe Princes have look't upon that Chimera otherwiſe than the higheſt degree of Impudence and Wickedneſs; however, they have acted as if they were really perſwaded of its reality, and by ſo doing, have ſet up an Example, the Conſequences whereof may be dangerous to all Crowned Heads. For if an ambitious Prince can make any conſiderable Party within a Kingdom, and ſtrengthen himſelf with ſome Alliances from abroad, will he not be as well grounded to diſpute and claim the Supream Authority, not only to the Prejudice of the preſumptive Heirs, but even to the Princes in the actual Poſſeſſion of the Crown, in maintaining, that they are ſuppoſititious? And there is none againſt whom one may not produce ſtronger Proofs than thoſe expected againſt the Prince of* Wales; *for perhaps there is no Prince who was Born in the preſence of ſo many Witneſſes. What could a Prince do for himſelf in ſuch a caſe, to preve his Legetimacy; but to ſay, that it was notoriouſly known, that the Queen was with Child, that ſhe was brought to Bed of a Son that publick Rejoycings were made through the Kingdom upon that occaſion, as alſo*

Com-

Compliments and Congratulations from Foreign Princes, both by Letters and their Ministers. These are the Circumstances that attended the Birth of the Prince of Wales, which the Protestant Party can say for nothing at all, since none but publickly undertaken to disown so black an Injustice, nor propose any Expedient to endeavour to make Satisfaction for it; though it may be easie and natural to guess, that no Expedients would be accepted.

ANSWER.

We grant the Forms of Treaties are, as this Author says, and the Successors are included therein; but the question is, To know who is the Successor to King *James*? Certainly it cannot be that Titular Gentleman of St. *Germains*; for as long as King *James* is alive, there can be no Hereditary Deceas; *Nemo est Hæres viventis*, is an uncontroverted Maxim in Law, so no Man can be his Heir while he lives; and if he has any, it is *in Nubibus*, our Law knows none, as it was asserted in the Conference between the two Houses about the Vacancy of the Throne. Who then is the true Successor to King *James*, who left the Throne vacant, but King *William* who fills it according to our Laws and Constitution? and therefore Foreign Princes are to own no other, and he alone can claim the Conditions of the Treaties concluded with the Crown of *England*.

This would hold good, altho' we should suppose the pretended Prince of *Wales* to be really born of the late Queen, whereas we have all the imaginable Indications of a base Imposture in this Matter. This Author thinks that his bare word will make the Prince of *Wales* Legitimate, but we must have Matter of Fact; and we defie him to give a certain Proof that the late Queen

was

was with Child, that she was brought to Bed of this Gentleman at St. *James's*, and that any Body else, except the Midwife (a Papist) did know they were Eye-witnesses of his coming into the World. There must be clear Proofs to answer the strong Presumptions we have, that they were carrying on an Imposture, as that no Proofs were ever given either to the Princess of *Denmark*, or to any other Protestant Ladies in whom we ought to repose any Confidence, that the Queen was ever with Child, as in good Policy they were obliged: The sending away the Princess, the imprisoning the Bishops, the sudden Awakening of the Reckoning, the Queens sudden going to St. *James's*, her no less sudden pretended Delivery, the hurrying the Child into another Room, without shewing it to those present, and the mysterious Conduct of all since that time, no Satisfaction being given to the Princess of *Denmark* upon her Return from the *Bath*, nor to any other Protestant Ladies of the Queen's having been really brought to Bed. All these Presumptions, so contrary to good Sense, and their Interest, must be answered by clear and undeniable Proofs, and not by a pitiful Declamation on the Consequences that this Affair may have. The Prince of *Orange* never promised in his Declaration, as it is here falsly advanced, That the Birth of the Prince of *Wales* should be Examined in Parliament; but only declared that he had Reason to suspect foul Play, and would refer it to the Determination of a Free Parliament. And King *James* having declined it, and carried away those who might Discover the Cheat, the Presumptions we had before are become Proofs; for let him say what he pleases, he mistrusted his Cause. The Compliments that he received on that occasion, signifie nothing to the purpose.

pose. The Author of the Answer to King *James*'s last *Manifesto*, says, That two Ladies appointed by the Princess of *Orange*, were not called to the Queen's Labour, tho' the Court knew of it: And this Particular being very remarkable, I have inquired into the Truth of it, and have been assured that the Countess of *C.* and my Lady *T.* are the two Ladies mentioned by him, not that they were publickly named by the Princess, because no such thing had been desired of her: But the Court knew very well that the Princess had desired them to be present at the Queen's Labour, to take care of her Interests.

But the Title of this King being not grounded on the Illegitimacy of the Prince of *Wales*, why should his Majesty, without any necessity, bring this Affair before the Parliament, King *James* having rendered the Examination of the thing impossible, by sending the Child, Nurse, and Midwife away.

The late King seems very angry with the Protestant Princes, because they have proposed no Expedients to give him any Satisfaction: But I would fain know what he means by it; unless it be that proposed in his first *Manifesto*, That the Crown should after this King's Death, Descend upon his *Welch Highness*: And if it be so, I don't wonder that the Protestants have not countenanced that impertinent Expedient; for an Act of Parliament having settled the Succession, and declared That it is inconsistent with our Religion, and our Laws, to have a Papist to Reign over us, it would be extravagant to propose to alter that Settlement. But since we are told that no Expedients are to be accepted, what makes King *James* so angry? Is he so fond of Compliments? Forsooth the Allies knew his Mind, and therefore would not venture to have

their

their Expedients refused. But is it not Extravagant to Demand that the Protestants should propose any Expedient, even at the same time that the *French* King, his old Friend, and the Cause of all his Misfortunes, offers to forsake his Interest, and own King *William* for King of *Great Britain*, without any Reservation, Exception, or Restriction? This *Manifesto* could never come out more unseasonably.

MANIFESTO.

'Tis true that they at first spread abroad some false Reports of the Secret Treaties his Majesty was entred into with the Catholick Princes, for the destruction of the Protestant Religion; but there is no body but owns the Falsity of that Accusation, since the Enemies of his Majesty have found no Proof of any Measures taken with his most Christian Majesty for that Design, tho' the Papers of the Offices of the Secretaries of State are in their possession these Eight years since. The Usage his Majesty has met with from the other Catholick Princes, who have forsaken him, and that unconcernedness they have shewn for the Affliction of their Common Mother, *are a sufficient Proof that his Majesty had not formed any Design against the Protestants in Conjunction with them, since they were so intimately united, even before his Majesty came to the Throne.*

ANSWER.

ANSWER.

I must confess I never saw any Treaty under the late King's Hand, for the destruction of the Protestant Religion, but I think his Actions are a certain Demonstration of his Design; for tho the Penman of his last *Manifesto* has the Impudence to say, That he has done nothing against the Protestant Religion, it may be made out by Matter of Fact, that he endeavoured to destroy our Protestant Religion, under the same pretence that the *French* King had destroyed the *Hugenots* in *France*. A Jesuit of *Liege* in a Letter to a Brother of that Order, tells us, *That the Late King was resolved either to Convert* England *to the Catholick Religion, or to dye a Martyr*. He did not only suspend all the *Penal Laws* against Papists, but by an Usurped Prerogative, that is *Paramount* to the Rules of the Constitution, and to all Acts of Parliament, dispensed with, and disabled the Laws that enjoyn the *Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy*, and which prescribe the *Test*, that were the Fences which the Wisdom of the Nation had erected for preserving the Legislative Authority, securing the Government, and keeping places of Power, Magistracy and Offices in the Hands of Protestants, and thereby of continuing the Protestant Religion and English Liberty to our selves and our Posterity. By those Means he advanced the most violent Papists unto all Places of Military Command by Sea and Land, and established many of them in the chief Trusts and Offices of Magistracy and Civil Judicature; so that scarce any continued in Power and Employment, save they who either promised to turn

Roman Catholicks, or engaged to concur and assist to the Subverting our Liberties and Religion, under the Mask and Disguise of Protestants. To Crown all, and Convince the World of his true Designs, he made *Father Peters* (a Jesuit) a Privy Councellor, by a contradiction to Reason and Politicks, which could not proceed but from a small measure of Understanding, accompanied with an unaccountable Pride and unparelled Bigotry. His Erecting an Ecclesiastical Court against the Laws of the Kingdom; his Prosecuting the Clergy and Bishops for Refusing to read an Arbitrary Declaration; the setting up of Popish Chappels; his sending Ambassadors to *Rome*, and receiving Nuntio's from thence, which is plain Treason by Law, and a great many other things I could quote, afford such Evidences of his Design against the Protestant Religion, that none, in consistency with Principles of Reason, can either question or contradict it. For had he contented himself to moderate the Severity, to which, by the Laws in being, Papists were obnoxious, and to render their Condition as Easie and Safe as that of other Subjects, and only taken care to preclude them such Places of Power and Trust that prevented their being able to hurt us, but could bring no Damage or Inconvenience upon themselves, no Body would have found fault with it; whereas by the violent Methods he took, the Nation was justly alarm'd; and seeing his great Intimacy with the *French* King, the implacable Enemy of Protestants, what else could they conclude, but that they had formed a Design to Extirpate the *Northern Heresie?* King *James's* Correspondence with Father *la Chaise* upon the same Subject, corroborates that Presumption, and his Carriage towards the Protestants of

Ireland

Ireland 1689, 1690. tho' Politicks obliged him to the contrary, have ſufficiently convinced us that he is, as moſt Apoſtates uſe to be, a Fiery Bigot, and as great an Enemy of our Religion, as the *French* King is, tho' he has not had the opportunity to ſhew his Zeal ſo openly.

We do not ſay that he was in Confederacy for that horrid Deſign with any other Prince than the *French* King, and therefore there was no need of his proteſting the contrary; but I ſuppoſe this was made uſe of only to have a pretence to reflect on their unconcernedneſs for the Affliction of their *Common Mother*. I leave them to Anſwer for themſelves; but I defie him to ſhew any juſt Cauſe of the Tears of that *Tender Mother*, unleſs he fancies that by an unreaſonable Fondneſs ſhe has more Love for him alone, than for a great number of her Children, which the Auxiliary Forces of the Proteſtants in *Hungary* protect againſt the *Turks*, the Allies of the Protector of King *James*.

MANIFESTO.

It ſeems then that it would be more honourable and advantageous to the Proteſtant Princes to think of remedying and ſtopping ſo many Misfortunes and Calamities brought upon Europe *by the Uſurpation of the Crown of* England, *than to endeavour to confirm it more ſtrongly by a Treaty, the Project whereof, as it is conceived, is as unjuſt as its Original. If the Catholick Princes are inexcuſable, becauſe of the ſhare they have indirectly had in this Deſign, the Pro-*

teſtants are not more juſtifiable, ſeeing the Divine and Human Laws, common to all Chriſtians, condemn ſuch Invaſions. And if the preſent Greatneſs and Power of the Prince of Orange *has inſpired the Proteſtants with ſome Sentiments different from their former, they ought to conſider that that Power is only grounded on the* Life of a Man, *after whoſe Death the Crown is to paſs into other hands, and another Family, even tho' all the imaginary Laws to ſettle the Succeſſion might ſubſiſt. But after ſo many Examples that the Hiſtory of* England *affords us, there is all the reaſon in the World to believe, that the Nation will return to its ancient Laws and true Maſters, as it has twice done within 37 years paſt; for it may be ſuppoſed that the laſt Revolution, proceeding from the ſame Principle as the former, and grounded likewiſe on the Subverſion of the Laws, will alſo have the ſame Iſſue. Then Proteſtants will be made ſenſible of the inutility of the Treaties tranſacted with an Uſurper, as it hapned in relation to thoſe concluded with* Cromwel.

ANSWER.

This Concluſion is as Extravagant as the reſt, and worthy of the Premiſſes; but if King *James* has no other reaſon to oblige the Catholick and Proteſtant Princes to procure his Reſtauration, he may certainly conclude, that he will never be reſtored by their means, and therefore he ſhall do better without troubling the World with his Manifeſto's, to wait with Patience, till the Nation return to their Senſes, and recal him. But truly, I wonder how the late King can flatter himſelf, that the World has ſuch a Concern in the Loſs

he

he has sustained, as to attribute all the Calamities of *Europe* to that Cause; for he may easily remember, that the *French* began the War by the Invasion of the Empire, and that *Philipsburgh* surrendred to them in *October*, 1688. near a Month before the Prince of *Orange* Landed in *England*: How then is it possible that this War should be occasioned by the pretended Usurpation of his Crown? The Treaty of Peace, whereof the Preleminaries are settled, does not please King *James*, for as he is a Man of no extraordinary Parts, and a meer Bigot, he firmly thought that the Catholick Princes, after having made use of *England* to bring *France* to some reasonable Terms, would immediately break with King *William* in favour of the Catholick Religion; though his Majesty has so often ventur'd his Life to oppose their Enemy. This noble Thought is worthy of the late King *James*, but it becomes him very ill to talk of the Violation of Divine and Human Laws; he who has so often violated his Oath, and the Laws he had sworn to observe. No Divine nor Humane Laws have been violated in his Person, as he complains of, but the proceeding of the People of *England* against him are Warrantable, both by the Laws of Nature, and Revealed Religion, and agreeable to our Constitution.

The Reflection he makes on the Power of the Prince of *Orange*, and the uncertainty of its duration, deserves a particular Attention, and seem to me, to imply the continuation of his horrid Design, to put an end to so Glorious a Life, by the Hands of the bloody Assassines he entertains at his Court; for what other Sense can

can one give of this Expreſſion, That, that *Power is only grounded* upon *the Life of a Man, after whoſe Death the Crown is to paſs into other Hands?* I know the Power of any Man ceaſes with his Life, and therefore it is no News to tell us of it; but God be thanked, his Majeſty is in the Flower of his Age, and very well; What then is the meaning of this Expreſſion, which repreſents his Power ſo uncertain? There is a Myſtery in this Paragraph, which the Author will not diſcover, but yet ſays enough to make us ſuſpect it.

King *James* may expect his Reſtoration as long as he pleaſes, I wont blame him for that, but tell him, that he muſt arm himſelf with Patience, for this Revolution being grounded upon the Laws, and the Original Conſtitution of our Government, he has no reaſon to expect ſuch a Revolution as in the Year 1660. for I do not underſtand what is meant by twice in 37 Years, and I ſuppoſe it is a miſtake of the Copy.

MANIFESTO.

Theſe are the Reflections that thoſe Princes ought to make, and which ought to oblige them to think of better and more ſolid means to reſtore Peace in Europe, *than thoſe they have hitherto propoſed, for the ſaid means being grounded on the Injuſtice, which has occaſioned all the Calamities of Chriſtendom; they muſt be one time or another prejudicial to thoſe who endeavour to have that Injuſtice confirmed, and ſo to triumph, after having imployed all their Forces to make it ſucceed.*

ANSWER.

ANSWER.

As what King *James* tells the Allies is very hard to be believed, being contrary to Senſe, Reaſon, Honour, and Politicks; it is not ſurpriſing, that he repeats in this Paragraph, what he has ſaid in the laſt, but from his Manifeſto's, and the whole Courſe of his Life, the Allies, both Catholick and Proteſtant, may conclude, that they could never expect any thing for the common Good from that Prince; for if he refuſed to ſuccor the Allies in the time of need, by the weak Reaſons contained in his firſt Manifeſto, when he owed nothing at all to *France*, how would he do any thing for the future againſt that Crown which has laid ſuch Obligations upon him? And how can it be expected that he ſhould keep in a juſt Ballance the Peace of *Europe*, which is now Negotiating, in which he is not concerned, ſince he did refuſe to preſerve the Peace of *Nimeguen*, whereof his Brother was Mediator, and made the Guarrantee? So that the Allies have no reaſon to concern themſelves for him.

But if they conſider that he deſires their Aſſiſtance againſt a Prince, who has been the Protector of the Liberties of *Europe*, and the only Barrier that was able to ſtop the Progreſs of the *French*, the Demand of King *James* will appear the more ridiculous and extravagant, and deſerving more our Pitty than Anger. The Allies laught at it in *Holland*, and *Monſieur de Calliere* being asked how they could countenance in *France* ſuch ſtuff as theſe Memorials, he anſwered, That they were very innocent, and would do

do neither good nor harm, and that they thought they could not deny to King *James* the liberty to Complain of the wrongs he pretended to have suffered.

The Conclusion we must draw from the late King's Manifesto's is, that God be thanked, he has lost all hope to be Restored by the free Consent of his Subjects, since he would ingage both Protestant and Catholick Princes to Restore him by Fire and Sword. But we need not to be afraid of the Effect his Arguments may have upon them, for they are the weakest that can be imagined.

Our *Jacobites* may learn from hence, how foolish their hopes were, that the French King would never own his Majesty for King of *Great Britain*, since the late King owns the contrary in this Manifesto, when he says, that the Treaty as it is projected is unjust, &c. which he could not do, if King *William* was Excluded from it, as some of the late Kings Friends do by an unaccountable and wonderful obstinacy still believe.

FINIS.

TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY DUBLIN